

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 11 stands objected to because of an alleged informality.

Claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,008) (hereinafter “Beckert”).

Claims 10, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010 B1) (hereinafter “Berstis”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 11 to improve the form of the claim. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 remain currently pending for consideration.

Objection to Claim 11

Claim 11 stands objected to because of an alleged informality. In particular, the Office Action states that “software for capturing said arbitrary display data” should be changed to -- software for capturing [said] a arbitrary display data.-- Accordingly, claim 11 has been newly-amended in response to the comments at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. A minor change to the Examiner’s recommended amendment has been made to improve the grammatical form of the claim by replacing the Examiner’s suggested “a arbitrary” with --an arbitrary.-- Withdrawal of the objection to claim 11 is thus respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckert. Claims 10, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Berstis.

With respect to the subject matter of claim 1, the Examiner pointed out that Beckert teaches that a “storage part (110, 133, 132 – fig. 3) is contained in a display panel portion (support module 62/base 46 – fig. 1/fig. 3) of the electronic equipment.”

Applicants agree that the storage part (110, 133 and 132) of Beckert is contained in the disclosed computer module 64 or the support module 62 as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Beckert. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the support module 62 resides in the “typically stationary base unit 46 (FIG. 1) that is mounted in the vehicle dashboard, or other convenient location.” See col. 5, lines 46-48 of Beckert. Furthermore, Applicants note that the computer module 64 in Beckert is situated in the dashboard-mounted base unit 46. See col. 6, lines 53-54 of Beckert.

On the other hand, Applicants respectfully submit that the faceplate module 60 in Beckert is situated on the detachable faceplate 48 (Fig. 1) which includes a logic unit 120, a keypad 52, a display 54, and IrDA port 56, and a CODEC 122. See col. 6, lines 38-39 and 45-49 of Beckert.

As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the memory units 110, 133, 132 which are asserted by the Examiner in the Office Action to correspond to the “storage part” features of independent claim 1 of the instant application are situated in the stationary base unit 46 instead of the detachable faceplate 48.

However, Applicants note that independent claim 1 was amended on December 6, 2005 to describe that the storage part is contained in a display panel portion of the electronic

equipment, and writing of display data into the storage part is enabled when the display panel is detached from a device body portion of said electronic equipment. Applicants respectfully submit that as a result of this advantageous feature, an external unit such as a personal computer can be used with the detached display panel to store data into the storage part contained in the display panel portion.

At least this particular feature is neither shown, nor suggested, by the disclosure of Beckert for at least the foregoing reasons. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-described advantageous features of the combination described in the instant application's independent claim 1, and the resultant effects of these features, could not be attained in light of the vehicle computer system disclosed in Beckert.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Beckert does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the additionally cited reference to Berstis, applied under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in combination with Beckert against claims 10, 18 and 19, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Beckert.

